

Day 9

**CIVIL JURY TRIAL
MINUTE SHEET**

DATE: 2/15/16

United States District Court	Eastern District of Virginia - Richmond Division
CASE TITLE Samsung v. NUDIA	CASE NO: 3:14-cv-757 JUDGE: Payne COURT REPORTER: Peppi Peterson Tracy Stroh

MATTER COMES ON FOR: JURY TRIAL (✓)

TRIAL PROCEEDINGS:

JURY: APPEARED, SWORN, EXAMINED ON VOIR DIRE () EMPANELED, SWORN TO TRY ISSUE ()

WITNESSES EXCLUDED ON MOTION OF: PLAINTIFF(S) () DEFENDANT(S) () COURT ()

OPENING STATEMENTS MADE () OPENING WAIVED ()

PLAINTIFF(S) ADDUCED EVIDENCE () RESTED () MOTION ()

DEFENDANT(S) ADDUCED EVIDENCE () RESTED () MOTION ()

REBUTTAL EVIDENCE ADDUCED () SUR-REBUTTAL EVIDENCE ADDUCED ()

EVIDENCE CONCLUDED () ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL HEARD ()

JURY CHARGED BY THE COURT () ALTERNATE JUROR(S) DISCHARGED ()

OBJECTIONS AND/OR EXCEPTIONS TO THE JURY CHARGE NOTED BY * JURY OUT:
DEFENDANT () GOVERNMENT () NONE NOTED () ** JURY IN: 9:30 - TO ANSWER QUESTION

INQUIRIES OF THE JURY RECEIVED; ANSWERED () ADDITIONAL CHARGE () RETRIED () -

JURY RETURNED VERDICT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF(S) () MONETARY AWARD \$ *lunch*JURY RETURNED VERDICT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT(S) (✓) *12-1*

JURY UNABLE TO AGREE () MISTRIAL DECLARED () JURY DISCHARGED (✓)

CLERK TO ENTER JUDGMENT ON VERDICT () TRIAL EXHIBITS RETURNED TO COUNSEL (✓)

CASE CONTINUED UNTIL _____ AT _____.M. FOR _____

MOTION(S) AFTER VERDICT: _____


Counsel for the Plaintiff(s)

Counsel for the Defendant(s)

SET: 9:30 BEGAN 9:20 VOIR DIRE: ENDED: 3:35 TIME IN COURT: 1:08
RECESSES: 10:00 - 3:13

Questions:

- 1) When we are evaluating claims for infringement or validity claims, do we only look at language within that claim or the entire patent document
ex: claim 3 vs. abstract
vs common sense
- 2) Where can we find schematic for nvii?


Gwendolyn Hart

Ct. Ex. 3



SS v. NVIDIA - Proposed response to jury questions

Angle, Robert A.

to:

Emily_Rose@vaed.uscourts.gov

02/05/2016 09:04 AM

Cc:

"Riopelle, Brian C."

Hide Details

From: "Angle, Robert A." <robert.angle@troutmansanders.com>

To: "Emily_Rose@vaed.uscourts.gov" <Emily_Rose@vaed.uscourts.gov>

Cc: "Riopelle, Brian C." <briopelle@mccuirewoods.com>

Ms. Rose –

The parties have met & conferred on the jury's questions from yesterday. The parties agree to the following:

1. For question #1, the parties agree that the Judge should direct the jurors to Instruction Nos. 23, 25, 30 and 45. Given that the jurors already have the instructions, the parties see no reason that the judge should need to read them again to the jury.
2. The parties agree that the response to question #2 is DX-22.

We will be ready to discuss with the Court at 9:15.

Best regards,

Robert

Robert A. Angle

Troutman Sanders LLP

1001 Haxall Point

P.O. Box 1122 (23218)

Richmond, VA 23219

Direct 804.697.1246

Cell 804.304.0636

Fax 804.698.5124

[Email](#) [vCard](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Blog](#) [Web](#)

Atlanta • Beijing • Charlotte • Chicago • Hong Kong • New York
Orange County • Portland • Raleigh • Richmond • San Francisco
San Diego • Shanghai • Tysons Corner • Virginia Beach • Washington

<image001.jpg>

4
C1 Ex.

This e-mail communication (including any attachments) may contain legally privileged and confidential information intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you should immediately stop reading this message and delete it from your system. Any unauthorized reading, distribution, copying or other use of this communication (or its attachments) is strictly prohibited.